

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/781,795

Applicant(s)

ARAI ET AL.

Examiner

Colleen A. Matthews

Art Unit

2811

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Colleen A. Matthews.

(3) Eric Robinson

Kana Ishizaki

Satomi Hata.

(2) Akihiko Higashino

Juny Maruyama

Hiroshi Sunagawa.

(4) Richard Elms.

Date of Interview: 15 November 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Applicant demonstrated the use of an adhesive with a thin film integrated circuit.  
Applicant also provided samples of the thin film integrated circuit in different applications.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-27.


Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0155317 to Bhattacharyya.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
Eric Robinson  
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant explained the claimed invention and the utility of the claimed invention in detail. Applicant also presented reasons why the amendment filed 11/01/2006 is distinguished over the Bhattacharyya reference. The examiner agreed to take the applicants comments into further consideration when reviewing the amendment and noted that an updated search is also required.